

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claim Amendments

Claim 9 has been amended. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 9-26 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 9, 11-15, 17-21, 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Martin W. Greenwood (GB 2281458 A) ("Greenwood"). The Applicants have amended independent claim 9 from which claims 11-15, 17-21 and 23-26 depend to further distinguish the present invention from Greenwood. Applicant previously argued that Greenwood fails to disclose the present invention, which arguments the Examiner did not find persuasive. Although Applicant further amended claim 9 to distinguish the present invention from Greenwood, Applicant continues to believe that Greenwood fails to disclose the present invention. For example, the Examiner continues to equate the term "monitor" (prior art) to "control" (our invention). A dictionary will confirm that to "monitor" is a passive activity, whereas to "control" is active and requires action based on an input. To equate these two suggests a basic misunderstanding of the present invention. Based on this fundamental misunderstanding, the Examiner has failed to recognize that, in the present invention, there is, in essence and in fact, a tandem power control operation going on--power to the power supplies and hence power to the transceivers.

As amended, the present invention as claimed is not anticipated by Greenwood. Greenwood does not disclose a telecommunication apparatus wherein an amount of traffic handling units of the plurality of traffic handling units as well as an amount of power supply units of the plurality of power supply units is activated in accordance with a power budget. While Greenwood discloses three power supply units, it is silent, and does not disclose nor suggest the *purposeful activation of only a part of these power*

supply units in accordance with a power budget. Rather, Greenwood is focused on reducing power to one of a plurality of *transceivers* in a base station unit based on one of the power supplies *unexpectedly* falling below a voltage threshold. Claims 11-15, 17-21 and 23-26 depend from amended claim 9 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 9. Therefore, the allowance of claims 9, 11-15, 17-21 and 23-26 is respectfully requested.

4. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 10, 16 and 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenwood in view of Hagstrom (US 5,410,740) (“Hagstrom”). Neither Greenwood nor Hagstrom alone disclose, nor in combination, disclose or suggest the present invention as claimed. While these references disclose an activation or deactivation of carriers, receivers/transmitters, etc., neither of them, alone or in combination, describe an activation of an amount of power supply units to match the total power consumption of the amount of activated traffic handling units.

A problem associated with the state of the art is that each power supply unit shows a power consumption by itself, i.e. consumes power to operate a circuitry of the power supply unit itself. Therefore, even when switching off traffic handling units to match a power budget, power consumption of the power supply unit or power supply units themselves will continue. This problem is solved by the present invention in that a plurality of power supply units are supplied and in that the control means are for activating an amount of power supply units of the plurality of power supply units matching the total power consumption of the amount of activated traffic handling units. This solution is not obvious in view of the references cited.

Claims 10, 16 and 22 depend from amended claim 9 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 9. Therefore, the allowance of claims 10, 16 and 22 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael Cameron', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Michael Cameron
Registration No. 50,298

Date: September 21, 2009

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4145
michael.cameron@ericsson.com